

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXX No. 8

August 21, 2018

175 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

State v. Allan, 329 C 815	47
<i>Conspiracy to sell narcotics by person who is not drug dependent; interfering with officer; whether trial court properly denied defendant's motion to correct illegal sentence; claim that trial court lacked jurisdiction over motion; whether drug dependency constitutes affirmative defense or must be proven by state beyond reasonable doubt; whether statutory scheme governing narcotics offenses violated separation of powers clause in state constitution.</i>	
State v. Evans, 329 C 770.	2
<i>Sale of narcotics by person who is not drug dependent; whether trial court properly denied defendant's motion to correct illegal sentence; whether claim of illegal sentence under Apprendi v. New Jersey (530 U.S. 466) and Alleyne v. United States (570 U.S. 99) was sufficiently colorable to indulge presumption in favor of subject matter jurisdiction; claim that defendant's guilty plea rendered motion to correct moot; whether drug dependency constitutes affirmative defense or must be proven by state beyond reasonable doubt; continuing vitality of State v. Ray (290 Conn. 602), discussed; whether statutory scheme governing narcotics offenses violated separation of powers clause in state constitution by improperly allocating judicial power of sentencing to prosecutor.</i>	
State v. Simpson, 329 C 820	52
<i>Murder; motion to withdraw plea; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court incorrectly concluded that trial court had abused its discretion in failing to conduct evidentiary hearing on defendant's motion to withdraw plea; whether Appellate Court incorrectly concluded that trial court had abused its discretion in failing to conduct hearing on defendant's request for new counsel.</i>	
Volume 329 Cumulative Table of Cases	79

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Carson v. Allianz Life Ins. Co. of North America, 184 CA 318.	42A
<i>Conversion; accidental failure of suit statute (§ 52-592); motion for summary judgment; statute of limitations; claim that trial court incorrectly concluded that there was no genuine issue of material fact as to whether plaintiff's action was barred by applicable statute of limitations; claim that fraudulent concealment on part of defendant's agent tolled statute of limitations; whether there was any evidence of defendant's alleged concealment or knowledge of any purported fraud by agent; whether agent's knowledge could be imputed to defendant for purposes of tolling statute of limitations; claim that continuing course of conduct doctrine tolled statute of limitations; whether defendant had fiduciary duty to plaintiff such that continuing course of conduct doctrine would apply.</i>	
Chaplen v. Doyle (See Doyle v. Chaplen), 184 CA 278.	2A
Doyle v. Chaplen, 184 CA 278	2A
<i>Paternity; child custody and support; claim that trial court improperly found that mother signed acknowledgment of paternity on basis of material mistake of fact; claim that trial court improperly concluded that opening judgment was in best interests of minor child after making clearly erroneous finding that there was no parent-like relationship between acknowledged father and minor child; claim that trial court misapplied law regarding laches and equitable estoppel; whether trial court's finding that acknowledgment of paternity was signed on basis of material</i>	

(continued on next page)

<i>mistake of fact was clearly erroneous; whether trial court's finding that acknowledged father did not have parent-like relationship with minor child was clearly erroneous; whether trial court properly determined that mother was not equitably estopped from opening judgment in support action; whether trial court properly determined that elements of equitable estoppel had not been established.</i>	
Landmark Development Group, LLC v. Water & Sewer Commission, 184 CA 303	27A
<i>Administrative appeal; appeal from decision by water and sewer commission granting in part application for sewer treatment capacity determination; claim that defendant commission improperly allocated 14,434 gallons per day of sewer treatment capacity to plaintiffs' proposed development when plaintiffs' application for determination of sewer capacity requested 118,000 gallons per day; whether trial court abused discretion by granting motion to supplement record and to conduct discovery regarding sewage capacity effectively allocated to another similarly-situated development; claim that trial court abused discretion by admitting supplemental evidence; whether evidence concerning other development was relevant; whether plaintiffs had prior opportunity to present evidence concerning other development to commission; whether law of case doctrine required trial court to apply certain factors with regard to sewage capacity because trial court in prior remand order required commission to apply those factors; whether evidence regarding other development constituted new or overriding circumstances for purposes of law of case doctrine; whether trial court acted unreasonably, illegally, or in abuse of discretion when it sustained plaintiffs' appeal and remanded matter to commission.</i>	
State v. Covington, 184 CA 332	56A
<i>Carrying pistol without permit; criminal possession of firearm; whether evidence was insufficient to support conviction of carrying pistol without permit; whether jury's inability to reach unanimous verdict on charges of murder and assault in first degree suggested that jury did not believe that defendant was shooter; whether jury could have found that defendant possessed pistol, as defined by statute (§ 29-27), at time and place of shooting; unpreserved claim that conviction of criminal possession of firearm should be vacated; claim that defendant's rights to trial by jury and to fair trial were violated because trial court's finding of guilt as to charge of criminal possession of firearm contravened jury's inability to reach unanimous verdict on murder and assault charges; unpreserved claim that defendant was entitled to new sentencing hearing because trial court impermissibly relied on facts that contravened jury's determination as to murder and assault charges.</i>	
Volume 184 Cumulative Table of Cases	81A

MISCELLANEOUS

Notice of Suspension of Attorney	1B
Notice of Reinstatement of Attorney	1B

(continued on next page)

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL

(ISSN 87500973)

Published by the State of Connecticut in accordance with the provisions of General Statutes § 51-216a.

Commission on Official Legal Publications
Office of Production and Distribution
111 Phoenix Avenue, Enfield, Connecticut 06082-4453
Tel. (860) 741-3027, FAX (860) 745-2178
www.jud.ct.gov

RICHARD J. HEMENWAY, *Publications Director*

Published Weekly – Available at <https://www.jud.ct.gov/lawjournal>

Syllabuses and Indices of court opinions by
ERIC M. LEVINE, *Reporter of Judicial Decisions*
Tel. (860) 757-2250

The deadline for material to be published in the Connecticut Law Journal is Wednesday at noon for publication on the Tuesday six days later. When a holiday falls within the six day period, the deadline will be noon on Tuesday.

Judge Trial Referee Designees Arbitration Proceedings - Trial De Novo.	2B
Personnel Notice.	2B
